

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/622,882	07/18/2003	Evan E. Koslow	KT-P-025US 2756		
22891 7:	590 07/11/2006		EXAMINER		
DELIO & PETERSON			MENON, KRISHNAN S		
121 WHITNEY AVENUE NEW HAVEN, CT 06510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1723 DATE MAILED: 07/11/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/622,882	KOSLOW, EVAN E.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Krishnan S. Menon	1723		

	Krishnan S. Menon	1723					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>29 June 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in completellowing time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of							
b) Mention the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In nevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in come of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.				
AMENDMENTS  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection.	but prior to the date of filing a brid	f will not be entered	hoogusa				
3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	.,		the issues for				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	, ,	jootoa olamio.					
4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.15.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	21. See attached Notice of Non-C	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	•	, timely filed amendm	nent canceling				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		rill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 8,9,21,85-89,93-97,100-105 and 108.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 10,11,14,15,17-1	<u> 19,22-24,27-29,31-37,39-42,44,90,</u>	<u>91,106 and 107</u> .					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	ut before or on the date of filing a l d sufficient reasons why the affida	Notice of Appeal will revidence	not be entered is necessary				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ils to provide a 1).				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	on of the status of the claims after o	entry is below or attac	ched.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ince because:				
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>13. ☐ Other: <u>attached</u>.</li> </ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)					

Art Unit: 1723

## Advisory Action

Amendment will be entered because it reduces the number of issues on appeal.

Upon entering the amendment, the claims will be rejected as in the final action of 4/26/06.

## Response to arguments:

Arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claims – at least the independent claims. "Biologically active metal precipitated with counter ion of a cationic material ..." etc are not recited in the claims. Applicant's arguments against the product by process rejection is not persuasive, since there is no evidence in support of the argument that structural differences exist, which are not taught by the references. Having the biological interception agent on "a portion of selected carbonized fibrillated fibers" is also not a patentable limitation: a portion can include the whole, so also the selected portion; such limitations do not further limit the claims; and applicant does not define what the portion is and how critical it is for the claimed invention. Carbonizing conditions are not patentable limitations in the product claim.

Applicant also has not responded to the double-patenting rejections.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krishnan S. Menon whose telephone number is 571-272-1143. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/622,882 Page 3

Art Unit: 1723

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L. Walker can be reached on 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Krishnan S Menon

Examiner

Art Unit 1723